Exhibit 16

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ET Plaintiffs, vs. GOOGLE LLC, Defendant.	AL.,) (CV No. 20-3010) (Washington, D.C.) (May 12, 2022) (3:00 p.m.)
TRANSCRIPT OF STATUS CONFERENCE VIA ZOOM PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE AMIT P. MEHTA UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
APPEARANCES:	
For DOJ Plaintiffs:	Kenneth M. Dintzer U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE 1100 L Street, NW Washington, D.C. (202) 307-0340 Email: kenneth.dintzer2@usdoj.gov
For Plaintiff State of Colorado:	Jonathan Bruce Sallet COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF LAW Consumer Protection Section, Antitrust Unit Ralph L. Carr Colorado Judicial Center 1300 Broadway Suite 7th Floor Denver, CO 80203 (720) 508-6000 Email: jon.sallet@coag.gov

APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

For Defendant Google: John E. Schmidtlein

WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP

725 12th St., NW

Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 434-5000

Email: jschmidtlein@wc.com

Court Reporter: William P. Zaremba

Registered Merit Reporter Certified Realtime Reporter Official Court Reporter E. Barrett Prettyman CH 333 Constitution Avenue, NW

Washington, D.C. 20001

(202) 354-3249

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography; transcript produced by computer-aided transcription

PROCEEDINGS

COURTROOM DEPUTY: Good afternoon, Your Honor. This is Civil Action 20-3010, United States of America, et al., versus Google LLC.

Kenneth Dintzer for the DOJ plaintiff.

Jonathan Sallet for the Colorado Plaintiffs.

And John Schmidtlein on behalf of defendant.

And, Your Honor, you're currently muted; sorry about that.

THE COURT: All right. How about now?

COURTROOM DEPUTY: Now we can hear you. Thanks.

THE COURT: Okay. Great. Good afternoon,

everybody. I hope everybody is well.

1.3

2.2.

So we are here on what I hope will be an auspicious status conference to mark the end of fact discovery. And so, you know, even before we get started, let me just say to counsel and to the parties generally, you know, this has been a long road, and I recognize that it hasn't been a road free of bumps and bruises, and certainly, I'm sure, there are more of those that you have than are actually visible to me.

But, nevertheless, I really do want to commend everybody, not just the counsel on this call but everyone that's involved in this case. And, you know, really, this is a Herculean task to have done as much as you have in the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

25

level of scrutiny as we could.

I said, there was a very high percentage of them that were clearly privileged, another large-percentage category that it's hard for us to tell but certainly seemed like good-faith privilege assertions. But I'd like to have some degree of satisfaction that that's been done for everything in this category. MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: Well, Your Honor, I will say that, candidly, the differences that sort of the lawyers who are involved, obviously, you know, a collection of 210 documents can be reviewed by lawyers at outside counsel and who have been involved sort of all the way, steps in the case --THE COURT: Right. MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: -- the larger group has been largely re-reviewed by contract lawyers --THE COURT: Sure. MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: -- under -- you know, under the guidance and instruction of outside counsel, and we have certainly gone back and sort of tried to refine and improve that process as we go. So can I sit here and tell you that the same -the exact identical level of scrutiny given the two sort of different groups? They're not going to be 100 percent but, we certainly have tried to make them as close to the same

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Well, I guess what I'd say is this. Given the focus and attention of these emails, I mean, I would like to do -- I do think we ought to, at least I ought to be satisfied, I think plaintiffs ought to be satisfied, that the same kind of scrutiny that was devoted to the 210 ought to be devoted the rest of that set. And, you know, I can understand why, perhaps, greater scrutiny was given to something that was going to be submitted to the Court, but I think you'd agree that that ought to not have been the reason why there was this 10 percent as opposed to from the outset. So I think, you know, that's what I'm going to order Google to do, which is to do -- and I'm not suggesting that if it's already been re-reviewed, you have to re-re-review it. But the bottom line being that I'd like to have some degree of satisfaction that you've gone back to these 16,000 emails and they have been eyeballed in a way that is consistent with the 210. And that to the extent those records need to be de-privileged and produced, I'm going to order Google to do that, okay? MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. All right. Is there anything else -- do we have a

date for -- is there anything else we need to take up before

1 we set our next date? 2 MR. SALLET: No, Your Honor. 3 MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: No, Your Honor. 4 MR. DINTZER: Nothing here, Your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Okay. 6 Your deadline for expert reports is June the 6th. 7 Can I ask you all to do the following? Can I ask 8 you to hold 3:00, if you're available, both on June the 16th 9 and 17th? 10 MR. SALLET: Yes, Your Honor. MR. DINTZER: Yes, Your Honor. 11 12 THE COURT: Just because I'm starting a 1.3 January 6th trial on the 10th. It should be over by the 14 16th, but it may not be. So I just want to try and leave a 15 little bit of flexibility there. 16 And as we get closer in time, I can pin down which 17 of those two days it's going to be. And if you all would 18 just submit something by June the 14th as a status update to 19 the extent there are issues that need to be summarized and 20 brought to my attention. 21 And then insofar as the issues we talked about 2.2. earlier today, you know, after you all meet and confer, and 23 if you all want to let me know by Monday or Tuesday of next 24 week what you've decided in terms of a deadline and in 25 the -- a deadline for production and a deadline for motions

```
to compel, just let me know and I can enter that order onto
 1
 2
     the docket, okay?
 3
               MR. SALLET: Will do, Your Honor.
 4
               MR. DINTZER: Thank you, Your Honor.
 5
               THE COURT: All right.
 6
               Anything else from either side?
 7
               MR. SALLET: No.
 8
               THE COURT: All right.
 9
               Thank you, everyone. I know this is a long slog
10
     and I can only -- I keep telling my clerks, I can only
11
     imagine what it's like for the lawyers in this case.
12
               But I really am grateful at your professionalism
13
     and how -- you all have worked quite cooperatively. And
14
     I know there's undoubtedly a great deal of stress and some
15
     conflict when it's not in front of me, but, nevertheless, I
16
     think given the scope of this case, and not only the scope
17
     but what's at stake, what's been presented to me for
18
     resolution has actually been quite modest, and so I
19
     appreciate that.
20
               All right. Thank you, all. We'll see everybody
21
     in a month. Obviously if you need me sooner, you know where
22
     to find me.
23
               (Proceedings concluded at 4:44 p.m.)
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE

I, William P. Zaremba, RMR, CRR, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-titled matter.

Please note: This hearing occurred during the COVID-19 pandemic and is therefore subject to the technological limitations of court reporting remotely.

Date:__May 12, 2022_____



William P. Zaremba, RMR, CRR